

could in the future. It could threaten the lives of other people, and that's why we have to continue to resist the passage of this horrible bill.

As Leader BOEHNER has said, Republicans can't defeat this bill alone, but the American people can. So we need you tonight to continue to call your Member of Congress and to say, We do not want you to vote for this bill. We want you to live up to your oath to the Constitution and be reminded that the 10th Amendment says, The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively or to the people.

We also want you to ask Congresswoman SLAUGHTER, Why did you say in an op-ed on CNN on December 23 that the Senate bill was not worthy of our support, and yet you find the sleight of hand to do everything you can to get the bill passed?

And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD the op-ed written by my colleague Ms. SLAUGHTER.

[From CNN, Dec. 23, 2009]

A DEMOCRAT'S VIEW FROM THE HOUSE:
SENATE BILL ISN'T HEALTH REFORM
(By Louise M. Slaughter)

Story Highlights: Senate bill isn't worthy of being called health reform, says Rep. Louise Slaughter (D-New York); Slaughter, who heads Rules Committee, says lack of public option is a fatal flaw; She says Senate bill would not stir competition among big insurance firms; Slaughter: Senate needs to go back and start over on health care.

Editor's note: Rep. Louise M. Slaughter, a Democrat, represents the 28th Congressional District of New York. Slaughter is the first woman to chair the House Rules Committee and the only microbiologist in Congress.

WASHINGTON (CNN).—The Senate health care bill is not worthy of the historic vote that the House took a month ago.

Even though the House version is far from perfect, it at least represents a step toward our goal of giving 36 million Americans decent health coverage.

But under the Senate plan, millions of Americans will be forced into private insurance company plans, which will be subsidized by taxpayers. That alternative will do almost nothing to reform health care but will be a windfall for insurance companies. Is it any surprise that stock prices for some of those insurers are up recently?

I do not want to subsidize the private insurance market; the whole point of creating a government option is to bring prices down. Insisting on a government mandate to have insurance without a better alternative to the status quo is not true reform.

By eliminating the public option, the government program that could spark competition within the health insurance industry, the Senate has ended up with a bill that isn't worthy of its support.

The public option is the part of our reform effort that will lower costs, improve the delivery of health care services and force insurance companies to offer rates and services that are reasonable.

Although the art of legislating involves compromise, I believe the Senate went off the rails when it agreed with the Obama Administration to water down the reform bill and no longer include the public option.

But that's not the only thing wrong with the Senate's version of the health care bill.

Under that plan, insurance companies can punish older people, charging them much higher rates than the House bill would allow.

In the House, we fought hard to repeal McCarran-Ferguson, the antitrust exemption that insurance companies have enjoyed for years. We did that because we believed firmly that those Fortune 500 corporations should not enjoy special treatment.

Yet the Senate bill does not include that provision—despite assurances from some members that they will seek to add it. By ending that protection, we will be able to go after insurance companies with federal penalties for misleading advertising or dishonest business practices.

The House bill would cover 96 percent of legal residents, while the Senate covers 94 percent. Compared with the House bill, the Senate's bill makes it much easier for employers to avoid the responsibility of providing insurance for their workers.

And of course, the Senate bill did not remove the onerous choice language intended to appeal to anti-abortion forces.

Now don't get me wrong; the current House and Senate bills are a significant improvement over the status quo. Given the hard path to reform and the political realities of next year, there is a sizable group within Congress that wants to simply cut any deal that works and call it a success. Many previous efforts have failed, and the path to reform is littered with unsuccessful efforts championed by Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Harry Truman and Bill Clinton.

Supporters of the weak Senate bill say "just pass it—any bill is better than no bill."

I strongly disagree—a conference report is unlikely to sufficiently bridge the gap between these two very different bills.

It's time that we draw the line on this weak bill and ask the Senate to go back to the drawing board. The American people deserve at least that.

We've had so many things said about this bill that have been misrepresented. We're told that we're the ones who misrepresent. But I want to say that President Obama has said over and over again, If you like your plan, you won't have to give it up. You can still keep it. But at our Republican retreat, President Obama was quoted as saying, "For example, we said from the start that it was going to be important for us to be consistent in saying to people if you have your—if you want to keep the health insurance you got, you can keep it, that you're not going to have to have anybody getting in between you and your doctor in your decision-making. And I think that some of the provisions that got snuck in might have violated that pledge."

The President admitted that what he had said and what he continues to say is not accurate because the bill that they proposed that we vote on is the very bill that has those things in it. It's the very bill that Ms. SLAUGHTER has said is not worthy of the American people.

Well, we need you to continue to tell the President, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and all the Democrats who have said they're going to vote for this bill that they are right, this bill is not worthy of the American people. It's not worthy of the sacrifices that have been made to keep us free because this is a government takeover of our lives. We will be giving up our freedom if this bill is passed. The government will take over not only our health care but ultimately

our lives. That is unworthy of the people who started this country.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McDERMOTT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. McDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, March 26.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, March 26.

Mr. POSEY, for 5 minutes, March 20.

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today and March 22.

Ms. FALLIN, for 5 minutes, today and March 20.

Mr. BOUSTANY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURGESS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, March 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today and March 20.

Mr. BONNER, for 5 minutes, March 20.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con Res. 54. Concurrent resolution recognizing the life of Orlando Zapata Tamayo, who died on February 23, 2010, in the custody of the Government of Cuba, and calling for a continued focus on the promotion of internationally recognized human rights, listed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, in Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1147. An act to prevent tobacco smuggling, to ensure the collection of all tobacco taxes, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. FOX. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, March 20, 2010, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from